UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,059	07/06/2001	Guo-Liang Yu	075977-0122	5121
Michele M. Sin	7590 03/24/200 akin	EXAMINER		
FOLEY & LAR		ROMEO, DAVID S		
Washington Ha 3000 K Street N		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, Do		1647		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/899,059	YU ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
David S. Romeo	1647		

	David S. Romeo	1647	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		=	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods:	he same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply original contents.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilant Americanient (1	10L-32+).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allownon-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 11-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	before or on the date of filing a Ne	stice of Appeal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/David S Romeo/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1647	
	i imary Examinor, Art O	1017	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-7 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating IBD, Crohn's disease or colitis, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of preventing IBD, Crohn's disease or colitis. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant argues that: "...solely to advance prosecution and without acquiescing to the correctness of the Office Action assertions, the claims have been amended to replace the word 'preventing' with the word 'ameliorating.' ...The claimed methods are fully enabled."

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner does not agree that replacing the word "preventing" with the word "ameliorating" fully enables the claimed methods because claim 1 recites "[a] method of ...preventing an inflammatory disease or disorder comprising administering to an animal in which such ...prevention is desired;" claim 11 recites "[a] method of ...preventing inflammation comprising administering to an animal in which such ...prevention is desired;" claim 17 recites "[a] method of ...preventing an autoimmune disease or disorder comprising administering to an animal in which such ...prevention is desired." Therefore, the claims are reasonably construed as encompassing a method of preventing IBD, Crohn's disease or colitis. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, as indicated in the rejection of record.

Continuation of 13. Other: Claims 1-7 and 11-17 are being examined to the extent that they are directed to or encompass the treatment of IBD, Crohn's disease or colitis. The other species listed in claims 1-7 and 11-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 06/14/2007.